

REMARKS

The foregoing Amendment and remarks which follow are responsive to the Office Action mailed March 20, 2003, in relation to the above-identified patent application. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for certain elements recited in Claims 12, 23 and 27. The Examiner also objected to Claims 18 and 26 due to informalities in the language thereof. Additionally, the Examiner rejected Claims 9-11, 14, 16-20, 22, 24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the Sharma et al. reference. Additionally, Claims 12, 23 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Sharma et al. reference, with Claims 13 and 21 being rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the Sharma et al. and Fjelstad references, and Claims 15, 25 and 28 being rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the Sharma et al. and Glenn references.

As a preliminary matter, submitted herewith for the Examiner's consideration are duly executed Power of Attorney documents transferring responsibility for the continued prosecution of the present application to the undersigned. Applicant respectfully requests that all future correspondence rendered by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in relation to the present application be forwarded to the undersigned for further handling.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended the Title and has also amended the specification of the present application only to correct certain grammatical informalities therein. Applicant respectfully submits that the changes to the specification highlighted above add no new subject matter thereto, and respectfully requests that such changes be considered and entered by the Examiner.

In addition, Applicant has cancelled Claims 9-28, and added new Claims 29-48 into prosecution. Of these, new Claims 29, 39 and 44 are independent in nature, with the remaining claims being dependent upon respective ones of these independent claims. In each of the newly added independent claims, at least one bonding pad is

described as defining a lower surface or terminal, with a molding compound being described as at least partially encapsulating the bonding pad such that a portion thereof which defines the lower surface protrudes from a lower surface of the molding compound. In certain ones of the newly added dependent claims of the present application, a portion of the die pad of the leadframe which defines the lower surface of the die pad is described as also protruding from the lower surface of the molding compound.

Applicant respectfully submits that each of new independent Claims 29, 39 and 44 is not anticipated by the Sharma et al. reference cited in the latest Office Action. In Figure 1 thereof, the Sharma et al. reference depicts a device 100 which includes an integrated circuit chip 110 attached to the top surface 121 of a die pad 120 through the use of epoxy 160. In addition to the die pad 120, the device 100 includes leads 130, 140 which are disposed in spaced relation to the die pad 120. Each lead 130 defines a top surface 131 and an opposed, generally planar bottom surface 132. Similarly, each lead 140 defines a top surface 141 and an opposed, generally planar bottom surface 142. The chip 110 is electrically connected to the leads 130, 140 through the use of bond wires 170, 180. The chip 110, bond wires 170, 180, die pad 120, and leads 130, 140 are covered by molding compound 150.

As is shown in Figure 1 of the Sharma et al. reference and specifically disclosed in the specification thereof, the molding compound 150 encapsulates the chip 110, die pad 120, and leads 130, 140 such that the bottom surface 122 of the die pad 120, bottom surface 132 of the lead 130, and bottom surface 142 of the lead 140 are coplanar with the bottom surface 152 of the molding compound 150 (see column 3, line 64 through column 4, line 4). This configuration represents a substantial departure from the structural attributes of the semiconductor package described in independent Claims 29, 39 and 44 where, as indicated above, a portion(s) of the bonding pad(s) defining the lower surface(s) thereof protrude(s) from the lower surface of the molding compound. Such protrusion is clearly depicted in Figures 5 and 6 of the present application. The teachings of the Sharma et al. reference also represent a departure from those dependent claims of the present application which describe a lower surface

defining portion of the die pad of the leadframe as protruding from the lower surface of the molding compound since, as indicated above, the bottom surface 122 of the die pad 120 in the Sharma et al. reference is described as being co-planar with the bottom surface 152 of the molding compound 150.

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the stated objections and grounds of rejection have been overcome, and that new Claims 29-48 are in condition for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 19-4330.

Date: 6/17/03

Customer No. 007663

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Mark B. Garred

Reg. No. 34,823

STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER

75 Enterprise, Suite 250

Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

(949) 855-1246